AGENCY ESTIMATE

OF THE FISCAL IMPACT OF IMPLEMENTING

SB 256 S1 2011 General Session

Teacher Effectiveness Evaluation Process

Sponsor:Sen. J. Stuart AdamsLead Analyst:Ben LeishmanAgency Contact:Emily Eyre 8 March 2011Title:Research Consultant

Agency Utah State Office of Education Office: 801-538-7671 Cell: 801-635-9666

A. Short Form (For bills that have no impact on the state, local governments, businesses, or individuals.)

If you can check all five boxes to the right, you're almost done. If the bill obviously doesn't have an impact, you're done.

State agencies will not require an appropriation to implement the bill.

There is no fiscal impact on local governments.

There is no fiscal impact on businesses

x There is no fiscal impact on individuals.

x The bill will not affect revenues.

If it isn't so obvious, explain what's going on. The most usual explanation is the codification of existing practices.

Attachments welcome.

If necessary, explain why this bill has no fiscal impact.

B. What parts of the bill cause fiscal impact?

Cite specific sections or line numbers.

Lines 143-146, 166-168, 194

C. Which program gets the appropriation?

Enter 3 letter Appropriation Unit Code.

For m	ıultipl	e ap	propri	ations
This is		of		

D. Work Notes: Assumptions, calculations & what are we buying?

Explain the fiscal impact in plain English, detailing your assumptions, methods, & calculations.

List all direct costs. Identify one-time and ongoing costs. Detail FTE impacts.

Do not say, "\$50,000 in Current Expense." Be very specific about what this \$50,000 will buy.

Attachments encouraged.

Lines 144-146 directs each *school* to form a joint committee and develop an educator evaluation program based on the criteria described in lines 178-194. Developing such a program will require time and resources at each school as a validity and reliability study would be required.

The substitute bill removes the student learning gains, instructional quality or performance, and parent, student, or community satisfaction components from the evaluation program and directs the Board to study these components during the 2011 interim.

Lines 166-168 and 194 directs the principal at each school to orient all educators on the evaluation program.

E. REVENUES Select Fund	Current Budget Year FY 2011	Coming Budget Year FY 2012	Future Budget Year FY 2013					
T	otal 0	0	0					
F. COSTS by FUND Select Fund Uniform School Fund	Current Budget Year FY 2011	Coming Budget Year FY 2012 154,410,000	Future Budget Year FY 2013 79,500					
T	otal 0	154,410,000	79,500					
Expenses by Category Personal Services Travel Current Expense DP Current Expense DP Capital Outlay Capital Outlay Other/Pass Thru	NDITURE CATEGOI Current Budget Year FY 2011 otal 0	RY. Coming Budget Year FY 2012 154,410,000	Future Budget Year FY 2013 79,500					
H. Non-State Impacts Your estimate of how will the bill affect: Local Governments The cost to each school to develop an evaluation program would be approximately \$140,000 per school plus \$100 per teacher for professional development.								
Businesses								
Individuals								
2010 Version 11.09 This is a draft fiscal note response from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and may be revised in the future. Attachments welcome.								

Lines USOE Costs LEA Costs	Requirement to Implement	Assumption	Fi	rst- Year Cost	Ongoin	g Costs
144-146 143-145	Develop evaluation program at each school, including a validity and reliability study. Database programming and maintenance	1084 schools; \$100,000 per school 1084 schools; \$40,000 per school	\$	108,400,000 43,360,000		
166-168, 194	Provide professional development to all teachers	26,500 teachers; \$100 per teacher for time, training, and materials. Provide ongoing training for new hires (3% of current teacher population). Total Cost By Fund		2,650,000		79,500
		TOTAL COST	\$	154,410,000	\$	79,500
		Personnel Services Travel Current Expense	\$	154,410,000	\$	79,500